

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 remain pending in the application.

**Claims 1-31 over Alam in view of Feague**

In the Office Action, claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,324,544 to Alam et al. ("Alam") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,247,135 to Feague ("Feague"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-14 recite executing, while an application is running on a personal data assistant, a **synchronization instruction from the RUNNING application**. Claims 15-19 recite executing a **synchronization instruction executed from an application RUNNING on a personal data assistant**. Claims 20-26 recite synchronization automatically initiated between a personal data assistant and a host computer by the personal data assistant **executing a synchronization instruction, while at least one application is running on the personal data assistant**. Claims 27-31 recite a synchronizer to **automatically synchronize, while a runtime engine is running an application**, data between a personal data assistant and a remote computer.

The Examiner cites Alam for allegedly disclosing a method for synchronizing file objects in object stores between a mobile device and a host computer. (Office Action at 3) But the Examiner agrees that Alam fails to "explicitly state the synchronization being automatically initiated between the personal data assistant and the host device by the personal data assistant executing the synchronization instruction." (Office Action at 3).

To cure this important and significant deficiency, the Examiner cites Feague for allegedly disclosing "a method for synchronization process negotiation between a client and a host computer on which data are to be synchronized." (Office Action at 3) The Examiner continues that Feague's "system begins synchronization **upon connection of the devices** by allowing them to automatically exchange acknowledgements and being a synchronization negotiation." (Office Action at 3)(emphasis added)

Claims 1-31 require synchronization executed from a SYNCHRONIZATION INSTRUCTION in a RUNNING application on a personal data assistant.

Even combining Alam in view of Feague, such theoretical combination of art would still nevertheless teach away from the claims herein. At best, the combination of Alam and Feague would result in a system that synchronizes a client and a host computer UPON CONNECTION of the devices. This is NOT synchronization executed from a SYNCHRONIZATION INSTRUCTION in a RUNNING application on a personal data assistant, as explicitly and importantly required by claims 1-31.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claims 1-31. Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-31 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman  
Reg. No.: 36,457  
Tel. (202) 261-1020  
Fax. (202) 887-0336

**MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC**  
2000 M Street, NW 7<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336